tion: Why It Led to Crackdown

United Press International

her Cabinet members at a Congress party executive committee meeting

ent on India, Deplores Newsman's Ouster

VERTZMAN
York Times

July 1—The
hholding any
—Prime Min-
's emergency
avoid giving
a pretext to
for the cri-
on officials
t shift from
rred today
criticized In-
in American
t.
ate of emer-
l last week,
tration has
ent on the
India. This
considered
l, based on
s American
Department

ficials—particualrly those who had served in India—had a sense of sadness over the developments in India and many might even be strongly critical of Mrs. Gandhi's actions. But he said the decision to follow a low-key approach was based on the following considerations:

¶The United States regards India as the predominant power in South Asia and wishes to maintain some degree of influence on Indian policy, particularly insuring that India remains independent and does not move closer into the Soviet orbit.

¶Given the volatility of the situation in India, the United States has no interest in taking sides in the political fight between Mrs. Gandhi and her opposition. A statement opposing the state of emergency would be interpreted as support for the critics of Mrs. Gandhi and invoke the wrath of the Indian Government without gaining anything for the United States.

¶The principal American security concern in South Asia is to avoid a new conflict between India and Pakistan, or a breakdown in India so serious as to invite foreign involvement. Neither seems likely at the moment.

¶Because of Mrs. Gandhi's desire to retain foreign respectability, she is likely to want

The Proceedings In the U.N. Today

JULY 2 1975

ARGENTINE CRISIS OVER PAY RAISES

Step Toward Talks Cuts the Tension, but Rift Remains

By JONATHAN KANDELL
Special to The New York Times

BUENOS AIRES, July 1—The political crisis in Argentina eased somewhat today as the Government and Peronist labor leaders agreed to continue negotiations over wage disputes.

Sporadic strikes continued throughout the country, and the Government decided to suspend most of the public functions it had scheduled to mark the first anniversary of the death of Gen. Juan Domingo Perón.

The crisis was precipitated by a Government decision to roll back recent wage settlements achieved by major trade unions in an attempt to maintain a program of economic austerity.

Labor leaders, who organized anti-Government demonstrations last week, met with President Isabel Martinez Perón last night and said they would meet again with her tomorrow.

The trade union leaders have thus far resisted intense pressure from the rank and file to call a prolonged general strike to force the Government to yield.

In contrast with the bitter recriminations of the last few days, government and labor officials had kinder words today.

"We are not delirious revolutionaries or ideological adventurers, and we consider Isabel Perón to be the natural and legitimate leader of the movement," said Adalberto Wimer, who has emerged as the spokesman of the Peronist labor leaders during the current crisis.

The new Minister of Labor, Cecilio Conditi, who met with the trade union leaders this morning, also sought to modulate the Government's confrontation with the labor movement, which had been its main support until the recent crisis.

"I believe the General Confederation of Workers needs the

morning in the Metropolitan Cathedral commemorating the death of General Perón. A scheduled march was

workers in Córdoba, Santa Fe, and Rosario, three key industrial centers, held work stoppages.

Schlesinger Says U.S. Is Willing To Use Nuclear Weapons First

By JOHN W. FINNEY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 1—Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger affirmed today that the United States had not renounced the possible first use of nuclear weapons if faced with defeat in a conventional war.

Contending that nuclear weapons represented an important deterrent, Mr. Schlesinger said, "If one accepts the no-first-use doctrine, one is accepting a self-denying ordinance that weakens deterrence."

He chose a breakfast meeting with a group of reporters to clarify United States policy. Some confusion has arisen since President Ford, at a news conference last week, asked a question that Mr. Schlesinger observed was based on the "false premise" that the United States had consistently disavowed the first use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Ford was ambiguous in defining policy. It, he said, of some Pentagon officials, Ron Nessen, the Presidential press secretary, has contributed to the confusion by some of his statements.

Policy Called Consistent

Going back for more than 25 years, Mr. Schlesinger said, "the United States has consistently refrained from disavowing the first use of nuclear weapons." During that period, he observed, first the Russians, then the Chinese were pressing for an international declaration committing the nuclear powers against first use.

The basic American policy remains unchanged, he said. But he noted that since the doctrine of massive retaliation in the nineteen-fifties, there has been a gradual evolution in policy to "raise the nuclear threshold" through increased conventional military capabilities, thus, he said, reducing the threat of immediate recourse to nuclear weapons.

The hope, he said, is that the United States will not be driven to use of nuclear weapons. But, he said, "under no circumstances could we disavow the first use of nuclear weapons."

His emphasis was on possible first use of tactical weapons, thousands of which are stationed in Western Europe. For United States even to imply that it would refrain from using the weapons, he said, would have "a devastating effect" on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which, he said, depends psychologically and militarily on nuclear weapons.

Under the new doctrine of selective strikes against Soviet military installations, Mr. Schlesinger also did not foreclose the possibility of first use of strategic weapons although he described this as "very, very low probability."

Mr. Schlesinger, as did Mr. Ford last week, took issue with assertions by former Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird that the Soviet Union had violated provisions of the 1972 agreements limiting defensive and offensive strategic weapons.

While some ambiguities have arisen about Soviet actions, Mr. Schlesinger said, "as yet there is no demonstrated proof of Soviet violations of the agreements."

The Russians, he said, have been "inclined to poke a little more in the gray areas than we would prefer," such as in the deployment of larger intercontinental missiles. But overall, he said, they have been respectful of the broad outlines of the agreement, "not only in the letter but also in the spirit."

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/nfuresearchschle00john